

Appln No. 10/760,206  
Amdt. Dated January 9, 2005  
Response to Office Action of November 14, 2005

3

### **Remarks/Arguments**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Official Action dated November 14, 2005. In response to the issues raised, we offer the following submissions and amendments.

#### **Amendment**

The amendment to page 9 addresses the typographical error identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, we submit that the amendments do not add any new matter.

#### **Claims – 35USC§102**

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,199,977 to Komplin et al.

Applicant submits that the cited reference fails to teach the combination of elements defined by Claim 1. The claimed invention requires the inkjet printer system to have a plurality of inkjet printer cartridges, and a number of cradles, each cradle having a recess that will receive only a set of the total plurality of available cartridges in the system. Some cradles in the system will not accept some of the cartridges.

The '977 reference does not disclose a cradle that will accept any one of several non-identical cartridges which form part of the total range of cartridges used in the system. The Examiner has equated each of the cartridge slots 134, 136, 138 and 140 to be individual cradles. Each cartridge slot is configured to receive only one of the cyan, magenta or yellow cartridges. There is no description or suggestion of any of the slots 134, 136, 138 or 140 receiving any cartridge other than identical cartridges. Therefore, the '977 reference fails to anticipate the present invention defined by claims 1 and 4.

#### **Claims – 35USC§103**

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected as obvious in light of '977 in view of US 6,250,738 to Waller. Similarly, claim 5 stands rejected as obvious in light of '977 in view of US 6,390,615 to Carrese et al.

As discussed above, '977 fails to disclose a cradle that will accept any one of several non-identical cartridges which form part of the total range of cartridges used in the system. Waller and Carrese also fail to teach this claim element. As the combined disclosures of the cited references do not teach all the elements of the claimed combination, they do not support a §103 rejection. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 5 are not obvious in view of the respective citations.

Appln No. 10/760,206  
Amdt. Dated January 9, 2005  
Response to Office Action of November 14, 2005

4

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,  
Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762